Vol. X, No. 24 HUMAN EVENTS June 17, 1953

YALTA SNAFU

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

"WE SHALL NEVER acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. I shall ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making clear that this government recognize no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement."

So said President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union message of February 2.

This loudly applauded statement seemed to portend a flat denunciation and repudiation of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements which had already been attacked severely in the Republican Party platform. Eisenhower as a candidate last October assured a Polish-American delegation of his opposition to Yalta.

But what followed this ringing declaration against the endorsement or condoning of enslavement was a pitiful snafu, compounded of timidity, ignorance and interdepartmental bungling. The mountain labored and produced a very innocuous mouse. The State Department submitted to the Senate a resolution that threw all the blame for the consequences of Yalta on Soviet violations of that agreement. This was bad history, bad logic and bad morals.

For the original Yalta pact, quite irrespective of Soviet violations of its provisions, contained some provisions which certainly made for enslavement and which should, therefore, have been repudiated, not indirectly endorsed. For example, the Yalta Agreement, as anyone may learn by re-reading it, sanctioned the annexation by the Soviet Union, without any plebiscite, of almost half of Poland's pre-war territory and about one-third of Poland's pre-war population. If this was not enslavement, considering the total eclipse of elementary human rights and liberties for peoples living under Soviet rule, then the word has no meaning.

This same Yalta Agreement sanctioned the seizure by Poland of unspecified amounts of German territory (emphatically a case where two wrongs do not make a right) and the use of German slave labor as "reparations". If this was not enslavement, then the word has no meaning.

At the same ill-omened conference in the Crimean resort, the American and British representatives committed themselves to enforce a kind of fugitive slave law for Stalin's benefit. It was agreed that all Soviet citizens found in the western occupation zones should be repatriated, by force if necessary. If this was not enslavement, then the word has no meaning.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RESOLUTION ON YALTA, censuring the Soviet Government for violations of the agreement, but uttering no word of criticism of Roosevelt and Churchill, could well have been composed by the Truman-Acheson Administration. A magnificent opportunity to redeem, so far as this is possible, a grave political and moral error, to serve notice on the whole world, friends, foes and weak-kneed neutralists alike, that the days of appeasement are over, to fulfill a campaign promise, was muffed with no adequate reason or excuse.

Had the resolution been passed in the form proposed by Mr. Dulles, the Eisenhower Administration would have been placed in the invidious and ridiculous position of endorsing, by implication, one of the most dishonorable and deservedly unpopular transactions of the bankrupt diplomacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Fortunately, Senator Taft blocked acceptance by proposing a reservation, that no opinion was implied as to the validity of the pact, which was distasteful to the Democrats. Then Stalin died and everyone forgot about the whole affair.

It is certainly far better to have no resolution on the subject than to have a resolution which could be construed as placing the seal of Congressional approval on the mutilation and partition both of Poland and of Germany, on the exploitation of the vanquished for slave labor, on the denial of the right of asylum to political refugees.

The Eisenhower Administration missed a most promising opportunity to make its breach with the appeasement policy (which was followed during the war and the first postwar years) crystal clear, by not presenting to Congress a resolution calling for lock-stock-and-barrel repudiation of Yalta and Potsdam. As the first of these pacts is naturally and understandably most hateful to Poles and the second to Germans the propaganda effect of such a repudiation abroad and at home would have been excellent.

There is also the consideration that the secret concessions to Stalin at China's expense which were part of the Yalta deal (cession to the Soviet Union of a preferred political, military and economic position in China's most industrialized region, Manchuria) were an important cause of the subsequent conquest of China by the Communists. Manchuria was the base and the arsenal for the successful campaigns of the Communist armies. And this was possible because of the Soviet occupation of Manchuria, so fatuously begged and bribed for at Yalta.

And the repudiation could have been placed on a technically unimpeachable ground, which has actually been invoked, on occasion, by the Truman Administration. This is that the Soviet Government itself has destroyed any legal or moral validity the Yalta

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Potsdam pacts may have possessed by repeatedly disregarding those provisions of the agreements which were considered contrary to Soviet interests.

For example there was never the slightest move toward implementing the Yalta promise that there should be "free and unfettered elections in Poland" or that democratic processes would be observed in the east European countries under Soviet military occupation. Nor has there been any pretense of observing, in the treatment of the Soviet Zone in Germany, the Potsdam assurances that democratic parties should be encouraged and that Germany should be treated as an economic unit.

TWO ARGUMENTS were voiced against a forthright declaration that the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements are null and void, so far as this country is concerned. It was claimed that such repudiation would make it possible for the Soviet Union to expel the western powers from Berlin and Vienna. And it was argued that Democratic loyalty to Roosevelt and Truman would make it impossible to obtain for a resolution condemning their handiwork (Roosevelt's at Yalta and Truman's at Potsdam) the large majority which would be necessary to produce a strong moral effect abroad.

The first argument cannot be taken seriously. It is both humiliating and unrealistic to assume that the United States and the other western powers are in Berlin and Vienna by kind permission of the Soviet Union. We are in these cities because, as the experience at the time of the blockade of Berlin showed, we cannot be put out without starting a Third World War, something the Soviet Government is not yet ready to risk.

Our moral right to be there is the desire of the legitimate German and Austrian Governments, and of the overwhelming majority of the German and Austrian peoples, that we stay until conditions are created for a safe general evacuation of all foreign occupation troops. The sooner this point is made clear in official statements, the better.

As for the second argument, one wonders how many Democrats, if it came to a showdown, would want to go on record as men of Yalta. The very word Yalta, despite elaborate efforts at whitewashing, is a cussword to the average plain American citizen.

Roosevelt did not go to Yalta as leader of the Democratic Party. He went as representative of the whole American people. He failed the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike, by betraying moral principles which are part of the American heritage and tradition and by abandoning vital American national interests. One hopes that somehow some day Congress will have an opportunity to pronounce a verdict on Yalta and Potsdam by voting on a resolution which unequivocally condemns these dishonorable and futile appeasement deals. The verdict might well be far more overwhelmingly negative than some left-wing commentators suspect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT IS A GRAVE error to regard Yalta as something that belongs to history, that has no relation to the present. The threat of a revival of the Yalta spirit is always with us. It has become greater as a result of the Soviet peace offensive that set in after the death of Stalin. This offensive is as phony as the proverbial three-dollar bill. Yet how few trivial gestures and soft words are needed in order to induce a dangerous letdown of the mood of vigilant self-defense in more than one European country! *The Economist,* of London, recently packed a wealth of wise criticism into one short sentence:

"What is surprising and alarming is to see how little has to be said from Moscow to obscure the memory of so much that has been done."

It is a typical Yalta issue, the handing back of tens of thousands of anti-Communist Chinese and North Korean war prisoners to torture, enslavement and death, that has been the biggest stumbling block in the Korean armistice negotiations. And the squeeze has been put on the United States to consent to dangerous and unworthy compromises in this question, to depart from Eisenhower's recent solemn assurance:

"We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gains for ourselves."

This squeeze has come from Winston Churchill, with his public endorsement of the Communist formula for prisoner exchange, from Nehru, whose attitude toward Red China has become a synonym for unrealistic weakness and futility, from the corridors of the United Nations, where fear has always been stronger of winning the war in Korea than of losing it.

Mr. Churchill seemed to be suggesting the possible pattern of a new Yalta when he advocated, in his recent speech in the House of Commons, "a conference on the highest level between the leading powers . . . confined to the smallest number of persons and powers possible. They should meet with a measure of informality and a still greater measure of privacy and seclusion."

It is curious that a conference of this type should arouse hope and approval when one recalls the names, and the dismal results, of four conferences of exactly this type which have already occurred: Munich, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam. The kind of skulduggery that can go on behind closed doors when a few men set out to dispose of the fate of the world is most vividly and candidly described by Sir Winston himself, in *The Hinge of Fate,* the fifth volume of his chronicle of the war, pp. 361-362.

With no apparent sense of shame or remorse, Churchill tells how he proposed to a receptive Stalin the partition of Poland and the mutilation of Germany, moving matchsticks to show how the eastern part of Poland should be handed over to the Soviet Union while Poland was to get German territory in the West.

The American people want no part in such cynical deals with the living bodies of nations, past, present or future.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 24 Wednesday, June 17, 1953 Washington, D. C.

On Book Burning: No fair-minded person can disagree with President Eisenhower's denunciation of "book burning" at Dartmouth College last Sunday. His remarks were immediately associated with Senator McCarthy's attack on the practice of the State Department (Acheson edition) of loading the American-subsidized libraries in Germany with books written by American Communists, and the recent removal of these books by the Department as a result of this pressure. If this is what the President meant by "book burning", he badly twisted the issue by using this inflammatory phrase.

The government has no right to suppress any book that people want to write or read. Or, to prohibit the publication or distribution of books. Neither has it the moral right to compel citizens to pay for books which they do not want to read or which they have no interest in circulating. The libraries from which were eliminated the books written by Communists who deliberately distort the facts about America, for purposes of propaganda, are entirely supported by American taxpayers' money, and the books are bought with the same funds. In short, we have been compelled to help support the writers and the publishers who produce these books.

JUN 25 '53

It would have been more to the point if the President had advocated the closing down of the libraries, so that the waste of American taxpayers' money would be stopped. The libraries were ostensibly established for the purpose of "educating" Germans in American culture or, to be more exact, to indoctrinate them with "democracy". The President did not question the propriety of one nation to try to impose its culture on another people, or the possibility of its being done. Nor did he explain how Communist propaganda would help its readers to understand Communism so that we might, as he said, intelligently meet it.

But, the most important oversight of the President was his failure to realize that for many years the real "book burning" has been the "book suppression" practiced by the Acheson-Truman State Department; that is, the exclusion from these tax-supported libraries of books written by American anti-Communists.

Air Power: The controversy over the five billion cut in the Air Force appropriations by Secretary Wilson continues to shake Capitol Hill. The big query — is the proposed whittling down of the air force a genuine economy move or a conspiracy against airpower in the Pentagon? Our sources indicate clearly a conspiratorial angle.

The five billion cut idea appears to have originated in the office of Admiral W. J. McNeil who is one of the assistant secretaries for Defense. The Admiral has long been opposed to a pre-eminent Air Force, and he is generally credited with starting the ball rolling to cut Air Force appropriations five billions. Next in the picture is Admiral Radford who will be the new head of the Chiefs of Staff in the Pentagon. Radford is a leading exponent of carrier-based airpower and his "fixation" on this kind of airpower is widely known in military circles.

The weaknesses of carrier-based airpower are — or should be — well known. For example, there is no fighter plane capable of coping with a Russian MIG that can take off from a carrier. Only a Sabre Jet can hold its own with a MIG — and Sabre Jets require land bases for operation. Again, it is impossible to launch a B-47 — our best medium bomber — from a carrier. The bombers that can take off from a carrier are limited in their cruising radius and striking power. Finally, there is this important point: a carrier costs around $250,000,000 whereas a land air base costs much less. If a land airfield is bombed it can be repaired quickly and without great expense. A successfully bombed carrier disappears beneath the waves and the whole investment is lost.

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our sources say that Admiral Radford collaborated with Admiral McNeil to remove five billions out of the Air Force budget. Then these adversaries of effective airpower pushed their findings to the desk of Defense Chief Charles Wilson. Wilson believes the army should be our primary weapon for fighting Russia — and would look with favor on any proposal to get more money for the army. Wilson's military thinking is influenced by the Pentagon clique which wants to fight Russia on land in the event of war and actually believes that the phantom NATO offers the best prospect of whipping Russia. He has no sympathy for the ideas of the Air Force.

Other points are brought up now about Wilson. We are told that while he headed General Motors he earned a reputation for being high-handed and imperious to anyone who crossed his will; that GM was actually happy to unload him upon the U.S. Government. Observers now recall Wilson's appearance — last winter — before the Senate Committee considering his nomination as Defense Chief. On that occasion Mr. Wilson scarcely displayed either modesty or tact, and managed, by his manner as well as words, to put up the backs of the Senators.

Because Capitol Hill knows about the activities of McNeil and Radford and are highly suspicious that the proposed five billion cut in the Air Force springs from a conspiracy against airpower rather than from a genuine economy motive — Wilson is still in plenty of hot water. The Defense Chief has already testified on Capitol Hill — but his testimony is still being kept securely under wraps. Those who know what is in it say that Wilson was evasive and left a very definite impression that he didn't know his subject.

Italy Speaks: It takes time for an old adage to prove its soundness. At the beginning of the Marshall Plan in 1948, we were warned that American dollars could not buy friends. And now the Italian elections indicate that we have probably wasted from three to six billions on Italy.

The Communists have increased their seats in the Italian Chamber of Deputies from 131 to 143 — and the left-wing socialists who are allied with the Communists have upped their seats from 52 to 75. The neo-Fascists have climbed up from 6 seats to 29. The result is that the de Gasperi government has a very slender hold on both the Italian Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. The results of the elections must endanger the European Defense Pact, and some observers wonder if the Italian Government will remain strong enough to take police measures against the growth of Communism. The present upsurge of Communist strength, legally protected, makes Italy of doubtful value as an ally against the Kremlin.

There is still another aspect of the Italian elections which deserves special attention. Signor Saragat is the leader of the right-wing socialists who allied themselves with de Gasperi's Christian Democrats in the campaign. Now, the Signor has proposed to his party that it break off cooperation with de Gasperi unless he admits to his government the left-wing socialists, out-and-out allies of the Italian Communists. We are told that Communists and socialists are poles apart; maybe that once was true — but today in Europe the socialists and Communists are joining hands with great frequency and ease.

The Italian election results should strengthen the hands of our legislators who want to cut foreign spending. One group wants to reduce that aid by one billion below the $5,800,000,000 requested by President Eisenhower. Congressman Dan Reed wants to lop off two billions. Why not cut it five billion eight hundred millions? — is the query that is gaining ground. On the civilian side our money is being used to promote socialism in Europe. On the military side it is being poured down a big rat hole — because NATO is increasingly regarded here as a military phantom.

Watch For: Early publication of a magazine piece by Whittaker Chambers, author of *Witness*, and key figure in the case of Alger Hiss. The article, it is reported, will appear in a national magazine and will deal with the controversial subject of "academic freedom and Congressional investigations". This will be the first appearance in print of anything from Chambers' pen since the publication of his best-selling autobiography a year ago. The writer, during the past few months, has been confined to his home with heart trouble.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Honor: In far away Korea, a man nearing eighty is down on his knees, as the first rays of the sun unfold to the eye the devastation of his war torn land. Again at night, Dr. Syngman Rhee, President of the Republic of Korea, goes down on his knees asking God for guidance in the mad world that has descended upon him.

And every morning and night for half a century this now wizened little man, who in his youth was converted to Christianity at a Korean Missionary School, has asked of the good God only one thing — a united Korea with the blessings of freedom for his people. In his last years, he sees only the shadows of failure gathering about him. For the Christian world has turned its back on him and his years of physical suffering and denial for the realization of a Christian ideal — the freedom of mankind.

The war in Korea is about to end — but it looks certain that the terms of peace will constitute only another inglorious chapter in the history of American bungling in internationalism. The Korean peace and our other tragic meddlings in the politics of Europe and Asia ought to convince even a person of fractional intellect that our self-anointed role of saving the world has been a costly and futile one — and that if we persist in this role much longer we will be destroyed as a free and prosperous people. Not only have we developed the ruinous habit of forcing our way into international wars and invariably losing the peace — but our increasing association with the politics of the old world has progressively robbed us of our once good name for honor and justice. The record shows that we have become as double-dealing, as treacherous and almost as unconscionable as the chancellories of Europe in our dealings *with either foe or ally*.

In World War I, Germany agreed to surrender on the basis of President Wilson's Fourteen Points. Thereafter England and France treated the Fourteen Points as a scrap of paper — and Wilson signed the Treaty of Versailles which embodied on parchment this double-dealing and outright treachery. Worse yet, we sat idly by while the British maintained for eight months after the end of the war an inhuman and illegal blockade of Germany which starved hundreds of thousands of German women and children. All this was serious reflection on our national honor.

In World War II — at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam — representatives of our government piled up an incredible record in the treatment of our *own* allies. We betrayed the brave Polish people. We betrayed Mikhailovitch and the people of Yugoslavia. We betrayed Chiang Kai-shek and handed nationalist China over to the Chinese Reds. And by this last betrayal we sowed the seeds of the Korean war, just as the Treaty of Versailles sowed the seeds of World War II. And now with thousands of Americans dead in Korea — and billions poured out of our treasury — we are about to settle with the Communists on terms which hardly reflect credit on our national honor.

Shillings and Farthings: British trading with the Chinese Communists all during the Korean war has shocked millions of Americans. It seemed unbelievable that a war ally would trade with the enemy. But the fact is that this is an old policy of England.

The historian Hendrik Van Loon once described England as follows: "That curious little island in the North Sea lives by and of and for just one thing — trade." And the British government has always put trade first, even though it may result in betraying the British soldier and in double-crossing allies. Our attention was called to a book by British Admiral M.P. Consett, published after World War I and entitled *The Triumph of The Unarmed Forces*. During World War I, England set up a blockade — a naval blockade of Germany. This blockade was highly effective. American ships attempting as neutrals to trade with Germany were seized and their cargoes impounded. But British merchant ships — incredible as it may seem — were allowed to pass through the British blockade and do business with the enemy — that is, Germany.

Admiral Consett says in his book that if the British government had maintained an embargo on British exports to Germany, the war would have come to an end in 1916. British shippers made a pretty penny shipping food to hungry Germans — but by such shipments they kept the Germans on their feet killing British soldiers from 1916 to 1918. In this two-year period, hundreds of thousands of British Tommies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

died in action. Sort of ghastly, British merchants betraying British soldiers in World War I — just as they have in Korea today. Admiral Consett refers scornfully to this trading with the enemy by British merchants as "our miserable and inglorious trade which prolonged the war".

Social Security: The National Conference of Social Work, one of the biggest uplift aggregations in the country, held its 80th annual conclave in Cleveland a few days ago. Representatives of practically every known form of welfare were present. Congressman Carl Curtis, the highly conservative Nebraska Republican who is Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee's investigation of social security, turned up as the keynote speaker. As the *New York Times* man put it, "many of the delegates expressed surprise". Curtis has been clamoring for years for a bona fide inquiry into Federal old age pensions (of which the entrenched social security bureaucrats live in terror) and now is in a position to get what he's asking for. Perhaps the real reason for his presence may have been the fact that the welfare boys in the back room wanted a little respectability to window-dress a deal that was cooking.

The deal involved Arthur Altmeyer. HUMAN EVENTS readers will recall (April 22) our description of how Arthur got his walking papers from the new Administration. Altmeyer had been the boss of the Social Security Administration for years and is, by all odds, the best known propagandist for Old Age and Survivors Insurance. Back in April, Congress passed Reorganization Plan No. 1 which raised the Federal Security Agency to Cabinet rank and abolished Altmeyer's job in the process. Speculation flourished about what he would do with himself. The speculations didn't last long. The welfare fraternity "takes care of its own". On the very last day of the Cleveland convention, Altmeyer was named President of the National Conference of Social Work, to take office next year. The social uplift delegates greeted the nomination with delight, and Altmeyer received the press with sulphurous denunciations of Curtis and all his works.

Bankruptcy: A big recent financial headline was the announcement that the Czechoslovak government had declared itself bankrupt. It was unable to meet its obligations, as represented by the securities it had issued, and repudiated them out of hand.

When a government declares itself insolvent those who had trusted it simply take the loss. They have no recourse; the debtor is beyond their reach. In the present case, the creditors were compelled to take the government's IOUs. They "bought" the bonds by way of a compulsory withholding tax.

Since a government has no income except what it can obtain from its people by the taxing method, it is obvious that the Czechoslovakian government got into financial difficulties because it could not collect enough to meet its debts, possibly not even the interest payments which the bonds called for. But also, under the totalitarian government, the taxpayer has nothing to say about what he must fork over. Therefore, we must conclude that production in the Red country had fallen to a point where there was not enough produced, beyond mere subsistence for the population, to meet the debt and the running expenses of government. Of course, the running expenses cannot be cut; that would amount to political abdication. And so the debt was wiped out.

There are two explanations for the shortage of funds in Czechoslovakia. One is that its slave labor — or overtaxed labor, which is the same thing — did not produce enough for the commissars; nobody works to pay taxes. The other explanation is that the "running expenses" of the government were higher than the possible income from taxation; that is what we euphemistically call "deficit financing". As a matter of fact, in Czechoslovakia both forces were at work.

Now, a "free" country is one that does not do the things that a totalitarian government does. However, if a "free" government does some of the things that a totalitarian government does, is it not on the same road? Bigger taxes and deficit financing are certainly in the totalitarian line.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED